

Mr. Speaker, I include the following three items from the Washington Post for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1995]
ANTI-NUCLEAR PROTESTS MAR BASTILLE DAY
CHIRAC SAYS TEST PLANS IN PACIFIC
UNCHANGED

SYDNEY, July 14.—Demonstrators around the Pacific opposed to French plans to resume nuclear testing held rallies and marches to try to spoil France's Bastille Day celebrations today.

But in Paris, President Jacques Chirac brushed aside the chorus of international protest and reaffirmed his commitment to go ahead with the testing, telling a Bastille Day news conference his decision was irrevocable.

Chirac said civilian and military experts had advised him unanimously when he took office in May that the tests were necessary to ensure the safety of the country's nuclear arsenal, complete the checking of a new warhead for France's nuclear submarines and develop computer simulation techniques.

"I therefore made the decision [to go ahead] which, I hardly need to tell you, is irrevocable," he said.

He repeated that France would sign and respect a complete test ban treaty next year and told French citizens the nuclear deterrent gave their "big modern country . . . political weight in the world."

Here in Australia's biggest city, Sydney, about 10,000 people shouting "Stop French testing" marched to a police-ringed French Consulate. Marchers, clogging four city blocks at a time, carried banners reading "Truffles not testing" and "Boycott products of France."

Expatriate Polynesians burned a French flag at a protest south of Sydney, and 1,000 people rallied outside a convention center in Canberra as the French ambassador went ahead with an official reception. Protesters yelled "No more tests" at guests.

An Australian legislator presented a 100,000-name petition to the French ambassador calling for testing to stop, and unions hurt French businesses with a range of Bastille Day boycotts.

Air France cancelled Bastille Day flights between Sydney and Paris and Sydney and New Caledonia due to a 24-hour ban on French military planes and French airlines by transport workers.

In New Zealand, about 2,000 protesters dumped manure outside the French ambassador's Wellington residence and heckled the ambassador and luncheon guests by chanting "Liberty, equality, fraternity, hypocrisy."

About 2,500 protesters marched on the French Embassy in Fiji's capital, Suva, and presented a 50,000-signature petition to the ambassador. Placards read, "This is not Hiroshima" and "If it is safe, do the tests under Chirac's nose."

On the other side of the Pacific, protesters marched in Lima, Peru, and Bogota, Colombia.

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1995]

A TIRED DEFENSE OF NUCLEAR TESTING

To pirate Randy Ridley's colorful phrase in "Why the Test Ban Treaty Fails" [op-ed, June 29], the "overripe remnant of the Cold War" is not the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, as he states, but any further nuclear testing.

Even when the United States and the Soviet Union based their security on mutual assured destruction, they tried to negotiate an end to nuclear testing and in 1978 came close to success. After Moscow had accepted the American and British position on key issues like indefinite duration, on-site inspection and no exception for so-called peaceful

nuclear explosions, the United States drew back because of the same flawed reasoning put forward by Mr. Ridley.

Now, when there is no Soviet Union, and when Russia desperately needs friendship with the West, the arguments for continued (or resumed) nuclear tests merit even less attention.

After nearly 2,000 nuclear tests, the United States has accumulated more than sufficient data to ensure the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. This vast experience would in fact lock in a tremendous U.S. advantage in stockpile maintenance. Renewed U.S. testing would instead automatically bring the British back into the game and impair our capacity to encourage restraint by France, China and possibly others.

Even more important, our espousal and the successful completion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would bolster our objective of preventing nuclear weapons proliferation. Just last month, sustained and adroit efforts brought about a consensus for the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The resolution on extension expressly noted the goal of completing a "comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty no later than 1996."

To renege on this promise would impugn the good faith of the United States and put the Non-Proliferation Treaty in renewed jeopardy. The same adverse effect would be created by any attempt to change the negotiating objective from a complete nuclear test ban to a treaty creating a threshold of as much as half a kiloton, as reportedly advocated by some within the Clinton administration.

Even after START II is fully implemented, the United States will have 3,500 strategic warheads on intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and bombers. No country contemplating a nuclear attack on the United States could ever assume that all of them, many of them or even any of them would fail to work. Our nuclear deterrent would remain not credible but irrefutable.

We made a solemn, formal commitment to achieve a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty no later than 1996. We did so because we believed this to be in the interest of our own and international security. The decision was a correct one and must not be repudiated.

LEAVING HIROSHIMA TO FUTURE HISTORIANS

To the Editor: Now that the Enola Gay exhibit has been mounted at the Smithsonian, confrontation continues. I write as an ambivalent observer in that my outfit, like so many, was scheduled for the invasion of Japan in August 1945; but after the first flush of relief at being spared, again like so many, I became an opponent of nuclear bombs.

There is not likely to be a last word for years. If there were one comment to make at this time, it might be that given by Golo Mann, the German historian, in a 1959 interview in Switzerland.

Dr. Mann, who had just published a distinguished history of the Thirty Years' War, was asked why, familiar as he was with more recent German history, he did not write about World War II.

Said he, "There are no refugees from the Thirty Years' War."

While millions of Japanese and Americans, combatants, and not, survive and remember World War II, we might as well put history on the shelf and publish nothing until 2045. At that centenary, when all historians will never have been there, they can fight a bloodless academic war without the intrusive oversight of those of us who were.

Milton R. Stern, Sarasota, Fla., July 10, 1995.

WHAT FRANCE RISKS WITH NUCLEAR TESTS

To the Editor: I commend you for calling on the French President, Jacques Chirac, to show courage and statesmanship by canceling France's proposed nuclear tests in the South Pacific (editorial, July 5). His announcement has caused outrage in Australia and other South Pacific countries and is provoking a response from organizations around the world from Greenpeace to the European Parliament.

But France's behavior should be of concern to us all, not only because of what is happening in the Pacific, but because of the threat to nuclear non-proliferation and the comprehensive test ban treaty.

With the end of the cold war, security priorities have changed. The threat is now from primitive nuclear weapons developed by states beyond the international community's scrutiny. Widespread development would likely see such weapons used in a regional conflict or in state-backed terrorism. Large stocks of sophisticated nuclear weapons and old theories of deterrence are no answer.

The indefinite extension of the non-proliferation treaty last month is one very important way the international community can protect itself against this new threat. A comprehensive test ban treaty preventing upgrading or developing of new nuclear weapons is another one.

Although the French said they will sign a comprehensive test ban next year, their resumption of testing undermines this commitment. As part of the nonproliferation negotiations two months ago France agreed to exercise "utmost restraint" on testing before a test could be signed. Announcing a resumption of testing so soon after such a commitment is seen by many nonnuclear states as highly provocative and will harden attitudes.

Don Russell, Ambassador of Australia, Washington, July 13, 1995.

OVERKILL RESPONSE

To the Editor: The French Navy's raid on the Greenpeace ship Rainbow Warrior II (news article, July 10) is a fitting prelude to France's coming nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

Paris has shown disdain for protests against setting off thermonuclear explosions in a part of the world often described as a paradise on earth. How in character that the French respond to the presence of a rickety protest ship with tear gas and helmeted commandos.

But, of course, this is an improvement over simply blowing the ship up as the French did a decade ago, when the Rainbow Warrior I was setting off on a similar protest journey.

David Hayden, Wilton, Conn., July 10, 1995.

□ 2230

HOPES, DREAMS, AND ASPIRATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about hopes and dreams and aspirations. As we come now to almost 7 or 8 months into this 104th Congress, where do we find ourselves? Where are our hopes and dreams and our aspirations?

First of all, in terms of our hopes, we have a situation on Medicare where we

would hope that we did not have a proposal that took away choice from our seniors. But today we have a proposal that includes \$270 billion in cuts, and then it includes, in the Senate proposal, to place a burden on the backs of our senior citizens, to eliminate their choice and the reasonable decisions that they make to select a medical provider by vouchering them their Medicare services.

I would ask that as we look toward the future, that the hopes would be based more upon a bipartisan approach to solving the Medicare problem; that we would realize that although we all look to provide security and safety for Medicare into the 21st century, we cannot voucher our way and allot our way into that safety.

My hope would be that we could come to the bipartisan table and recognize that fraud and abuse are ways of downsizing the problems of Medicare, but the loss of \$270 billion is not.

I would hope that we would be able to say to the senior citizens that we would work collectively with some of the suggestions that have been made in order to ensure a system that works into the 21st century. I would hope that we could say that to our rural hospital systems, our urban hospital systems, as well our local and State governments who will bear the burden of this loss.

And then I would say that maybe we can keep the dream alive, and that is the dream of Dr. Martin Luther King, and not divide this House on the issue of race and affirmative action.

I would hope that this week, beginning July 24, we would not have a frivolous and fruitless debate on eliminating affirmative action tied to the Department of Defense appropriation bill without any manner of hearings or documentation that the abuse has been such that requires this kind of amendment.

I hope that this Nation realizes that race is still a factor, that discrimination is still prevalent, that the dream of Dr. King is trying to survive, but it is not yet there. And I would hope this House, in its wisdom, the leadership of this House, would not allow such a destructive, divisive amendment to come to the floor, especially when no documentation in this House has yet been established as to which direction to go to respond to the concerns of the American people who, I believe, believe in equality for all.

And so the dream this evening is that we would come together recognizing that some of our dreams have not yet been met and that affirmative action is not the fight to take the U.S. Congress and particularly the House of Representatives in its most imperfect sense, by an amendment that has no justification and has no reason to eliminate this very vital program that allows people to have equal opportunity.

And then I hope we will reach to our aspirations, and that is that we can

likewise come together in a bipartisan manner as we look towards space, as we understand our destiny as Americans, as we realize that the space station is not just another piece of iron machinery, but it is based upon the aspirations of Americans.

It emphasizes our ability to explore and search and find and discover. It helps us in medical research; it helps us determine the maximum capacity of the human body; it helps us understand where we will go in the 21st century as it relates to science.

It is not a space station of local regions; it is a space station of America. And just as we aspired to go to the Moon and looked in hope and dreamed about being an astronaut and celebrated the successes when Americans made their first steps on the Moon, here now we have an opportunity to associate and cooperate with our European partners, our Russian partners. But most importantly, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to allow our children to dream, to then work, but to create better opportunities and a better quality of life for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by simply saying, let us have hope for a better Medicare system to save it for our senior citizens, let us dream for equality for all Americans and thereby eliminate divisive talk about affirmative action and race in this Nation, and let us aspire, yes, and dream for the 21st century so that we too can find out what makes the space tick, if you will, and find a better way to live in all the research that will be brought about through the space station.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to the House this evening about a subject that does not seem at times to be the sexiest topic around here, although I think at times it does draw a great deal of emotion from many of the Members as was demonstrated when we began to and finished the debate on the ag appropriation bill.

It is a subject that I know many Members are very interested in and that is the subject commonly referred to as agriculture.

When I was running for election to this House, I told the people in my district that I wanted to serve on the Committee on Agriculture because of the importance of agriculture to my district, to the country, but because my district has had a very rich heritage of representation on the ag committee from former Congressman Paul Finley, who was the ranking member of the Ag Committee when he left the

Congress in 1982; Congressman Ed Madigan, the late Ed Madigan, who was the ranking member and then went on to serve as the Secretary of Agriculture; and then my former boss and mentor, the former Republican leader, Bob Michel, who was on the ag appropriations subcommittee for 25 years.

We have had a rich heritage in my district of representing agriculture, and that is something that I wanted to continue.

And there are three goals that I want to lay out and say to the American people that we need to strive for as we mark up the ag bill: No. 1, farm programs should not be singled out for spending cuts. All Federal programs should be on the table. Agriculture is willing to take its fair share, and I know that.

From talking to the farmers in my district, I know they are willing to take their fair share. They have taken their fair share over the last 10 years and when you look at the decreases in agriculture programs, while all other programs of Government have increased, agriculture has taken its fair share.

No. 2, spending cuts should go to reduce the deficit, not to spend on other programs, as has been the case in the last 10 years.

And finally, Congress must deliver on promises to roll back the tidal wave of burdensome regulation, provide consistency and predictability in our export markets and restore fairness and sanity to our Tax Code. I think if we could meet those three goals, we would be serving agriculture well and serving all Americans.

I am joined this evening by three distinguished colleagues from the House of Representatives, and I would like to provide an opportunity for them to sound off for a minute or two about some important issues related to agriculture in their districts.

I think what I would like to do is yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], who comes here from an agricultural district, and having been appointed by the Speaker of the House to chair a task force for those members who do not sit on the Ag Committee and are not intimately involved in the everyday workings, as some of us are, for whatever comments.

I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], and welcome his comments with respect to what he has been doing with his task force and other matters that he would like to address the House with.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much not only for yielding but for his participation as a Member of the Task Force on Agriculture that Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. ROBERTS, the chairman of the Ag Committee have approved as something that is vitally important to the agriculture industry in this country.

You have been very involved in this task force, Mr. LAHOOD, and I really appreciate your input and your advice and your good counsel.